Application Serial No. 10/581,231   PATENT
Reply to final office action of November 19, 2009   Docket: CU-4813

Remarks and Arguments

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9 and 10 are pending in the present application before this amendment. By the present amendment, claims 1 and 7 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Regarding Claim Objections

"the service processing unit" recited in claim 1, lines 16-17 and claim 7, line 7 and line 18-19 are amended to recite --the service processing units--.

Regarding claim rejections – 35 USC § 103

In this final Office Action (page 2), the Examiner rejects claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,369,574 (Parruck). The "et al." suffix is omitted in the Parruck reference.

The applicants have carefully reviewed the rejection and the cited prior art, but are compelled to respectfully disagree with the Examiner for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 of the present application discloses a synchronous digital hierarchy tributary module supporting multiple service processing. The tributary module further includes a multiple service cross processing unit, wherein the multiple service cross processing unit has been further limited by:

> --being adapted to interconnect service signals unmapped by the at least two service processing units, and further adapted to transfer a service signal from the local interface to the service processing unit for mapping and transfer an unmapped service signal from the service processing unit to the local interface--.

Therefore, the multiple service cross processing unit as limited in amended claim 1 can be used to interconnect unmapped service signals between the at least two service processing units, thereby implementing interconnection of different services in a Synchronous Digital Hierarchy (SDH) tributary module, i.e. interconnection of

Page 5 of 8

unmapped SDH service signals corresponding to different services. With such a multiple service cross processing unit, a service can be transported from one service processing unit to another.

In addition, the multiple service cross processing units as limited in amended claim 1 can further be used to transfer both to-be-mapped service signals and unmapped service signals between the local interfaces and the service processing units, and as can be further understood from the above discussion and Figures 3 and 4 of the present application, the service signals interconnected by the multiple service cross processing unit are all bidirectional.

In contrast, Parruck discloses that

"cell and packet traffic received from fiber optic cable 14 and transmitted on fiber optic cable 15 are time division multiplexed/demultiplexed by TDM device 16. Cell traffic is handled by integrated circuit device 17. Packet traffic is handled by integrated circuit device 18"

(see Column 3, lines 25-29; Figure 3).

As can be seen from the above, fiber optic cable 14 is used to receive cell and packet traffic, fiber optic cable 15 is used to transmit cell and packet traffic and TDM device 16 is used to time division multiplex/demultiplex the cell and packet traffic. However, nowhere in Parruck's disclosure discloses or teaches that the TDM device 16 can be used to interconnect the Cell traffic and the Packet traffic.

Moreover, as can be seen from the arrow line shown in Figure 3 of Parruck, the fiber optic cables 14 and 15 are unidirectional, which is different from the bidirectional service signals interconnected by the multiple service cross processing unit taught by claim 1 of the present application.

At least for the reasons presented above, it can be derived that the multiple service cross processing unit as limited in claim 1 of the present application is different from the TDM device 16 as disclosed by Parruck.

Furthermore, it can be seen from Figure 3 of Parruck that line card 12 is coupled to a switch fabric of a router. In fact, Parruck relates to line card circuitry disposed within

Application Serial No. 10/581,231   PATENT
Reply to final office action of November 19, 2009   Docket: CU-4813

routers and switches, but does not relate at all to synchronous digital hierarchy multi-service transfer.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Parruck et al. to employ multiple different service processing units in one line card in the SDH tributary module as in claim 1, and further to implement a cross processing unit to interconnect the different service processing units.

Based on the above, the applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of claim 1 is non-obvious and thus patentable over AAPA in view of Parruck et al.

For reasons similar to those presented above with respect to claim 1, the subject matter of claim 7, which includes limitations corresponding to those in claim 1, is non-obvious and thus patentable over AAPA in view of Parruck et al.

Claims 5-6 and 9-10 depend from claims 1 and 7 respectively. The applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency as well as the additional features recited in each of these claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

For the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 6, 7, 9 and 10 pending in this application are in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and earnestly solicit an indication of allowable subject matter.

This amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised in the office action. Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the examiner is

Application Serial No. 10/581,231   PATENT
Reply to final office action of November 19, 2009   Docket: CU-4813

encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _January 19_, 2010

W. William Park, Reg. No. 55,523
Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300

Page 8 of 8